

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 18, 2007. In that Office Action, claims 1-21 were rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 21 are being amended. Accordingly, claims 1-21 remain pending in the application.

Rejections under §102(b)

Pending claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lazaridis et al. (US 6,219,694). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Lazaridis is directed to a system and method for pushing information from a host system to a mobile data communication device upon sensing a trigger event. (Lazaridis, Abstract.) Lazaridis discloses two main embodiments. In one embodiment, the host system is a desktop computer running a redirection program. The redirection program on the desktop receives messages from a server and determines whether the mobile device can receive the message based on message types pre-selected by the user or based on messages that the mobile device can process. (Lazaridis, Col. 7, Ln. 57-60 and Col. 7, Ln. 66- Col. 8, Ln. 2.) If the mobile device cannot accept the type of message, the redirection program redirects the message from the desktop computer to a fax or voice number where the user is located. (Lazaridis, Col. 7, Ln. 60-65.)

In the second embodiment, the redirection program runs on a server. (Lazaridis, Col. 9, Ln 23.) A configuration of each mobile device is located on each user's desktop system including information whether a particular user can have data items redirected and which types of messages and information to redirect. (Lazaridis, Col 9, Ln 34-40.) When an event occurs on the desktop (such as message notification), a trigger is generated and transmitted to the server, which then determines whether the desktop has redirect capabilities. (Lazaridis, Col. 9, Ln 52- 64.) If so, and if the message is a type selected to redirect to the mobile device, then the server repackages the message and redirects it to the mobile device. (Lazaridis, Col. 9, Ln 65 – Col. 10, Ln 7.)

Independent Claim 1

In contrast to the Lazaridis patent, the subject matter of Applicant's claim is directed to an entirely different method used for a different purpose. Lazaridis is addressing a system and methods for directing only content that can be handled by the mobile device or that has been pre-selected by a user. Amended claim 1, on the other hand, is directed to a method for handling attachments of email messages already delivered to a mobile vehicle. More specifically, amended claim 1 is directed to a method for accessing an email attachment from a mobile vehicle, including the steps of “*determining at the vehicle* a classification of the email attachment” and “*routing the email attachment within the vehicle based on the classification such that the email attachment is provided to a vehicle communication unit* enabled to present the content of the email attachment.” These steps are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record.

In particular, Lazaridis does not disclose *determining at a vehicle* a classification of the email attachment. Although Lazaridis discloses redirecting messages to a mobile device, Lazaridis does not teach determining on the mobile device a classification of an email attachment. In the embodiments disclosed Lazaridis, the redirecting program determines *at the server or a user's desktop computer*, and *not at the mobile device*, which attachments *to redirect to the mobile device* because the purpose of the redirecting program in Lazaridis is to direct only those messages to the mobile device that the mobile device can receive and process and that are pre-selected by the user. Column 6, line 14 states that the system redirects “certain message attachments to such an external machine 30 if the redirector program configuration data reflects that the mobile device 24 cannot receive and process the attachments, or if the user has specified that certain attachments are not to be forwarded to mobile device 24.” Lazaridis does not determine the classification of the attachment at the mobile device because one of the objectives of Lazaridis is to avoid sending attachments to the mobile device that the mobile device cannot process and present to the user. In contrast to Lazaridis, Applicants' method of claim 1 *receives attachments at the telematics unit* and makes the *determination at the*

vehicle of the classification of the email attachment. As such, Lazaridis does not teach or suggest this limitation of claim 1.

Lazaridis also does not teach or suggest *routing* the email attachment *within the vehicle based on the classification such that the email attachment is provided to a vehicle communication unit* enabled to present the content of the email attachment. Again, because Lazaridis teaches only sending attachments to the mobile device that the mobile device can receive and process and that are pre-selected to be received by the mobile device, the mobile device in Lazaridis does not itself route the attachments to other devices. Rather, the attachments are routed to the other devices (fax or voice mail) from the desktop or server running the redirection software. As such, Lazaridis does not teach or suggest the routing step of claim 1.

Furthermore, given the different purpose of Lazaridis's system compared to Applicants', this subject matter of claim 1 is not obvious in view of Lazaridis, whether considered singly or in combination with other prior art of record.

Claims 2-7 ultimately depend from claim 1. In view of the reasons articulated above, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 are patentable over Lazaridis.

Independent Claims 8 and 15

Similar to claim 1, amended independent claim 8 calls for *computer readable code for determining at the vehicle a classification of the email attachment and computer readable code for routing the email attachment within the vehicle based on the classification such that the email attachment is provided to a vehicle communication unit* enabled to present the content of the email attachment. Likewise, similar to claim 1, amended independent claim 15 calls for *means for determining at the vehicle a classification of the email attachment and means for routing the email attachment within the vehicle based on the classification such that the email attachment is provided to a vehicle communication unit* enabled to present the content of the email attachment. Therefore, for reasons similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, these steps are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record.

Claims 9-14 each ultimately depend from claim 8, and claims 16-21 each ultimately depend from claim 15. In view of amended claims 8 and 15, and at least for the reasons articulated above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-21 are patentable over the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable over the prior art. Reconsideration is therefore requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if doing so would advance prosecution of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0960 for any required fees or to credit that same deposit account with any overpayment associated with this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

REISING, ETHINGTON, BARNES, KISSELLE, P.C.

/James D. Stevens/

Date: April 18, 2007
JDS/GGB

James D. Stevens
Registration No. 35,691
P.O. Box 4390
Troy, Michigan 48099
(248) 689-3500